THE FORTUNE OF THE ROMAN ELEGISTS, PROPERTIUS AND TIBULLUS, IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO RONSARD

BY

ROBERT EDWARD HALLOWELL

B.Ed., Eastern Illinois State Teachers College, 1939

M.A., University of Illinois, 1940

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN FRENCH IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1942

URBANA, ILLINOIS

1942

THE FORTUNE OF THE ROMAN ELEGISTS, PROPERTIUS AND TIBULLUS, IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO RONSARD

BY
ROBERT EDWARD HALLOWELL
B.Ed., Eastern Illinois State Teachers College, 1939
M.A., University of Illinois, 1940

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
FRENCH IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1942

URBANA, ILLINOIS
1942

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41549818_0153

THE FORTUNE OF THE ROMAN ELEGISTS, PROPERTIUS AND TIBULLUS, IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO RONSARD

Introduction

The reader of Ronsard's love lyrics readily perceives that the poet's debt to the Roman elegists is great. He notices that Ronsard often borrows a line or strophe from them, but more frequently he takes an elegiac theme and then proceeds to treat it in his own original manner. MM. Pierre de Nolhac, Henri Chamard, and Paul Laumonier have all discussed to some extent the influence of the elegists on Ronsard. M. Laumonier, especially in his critical edition of Ronsard's works, has very painstakingly pointed out the numerous parallel lines and passages in the works of Ronsard and the Latin elegiac poets. No one has as yet studied this influence critically, however, in an attempt to analyze the research already done, to evaluate the material, and to arrive at conclusions regarding the extent of Ronsard's debt to the Roman elegy. It is the purpose of the present study to accomplish these objectives.

It was my original intention to consider Catullus as well as Propertius and Tibullus in this work, but Miss M. G. Morrison of Cambridge University completed in 1941 her study of the *Influence of Catullus in the Sixteenth Century on French Literature.* Without having had the opportunity to read her thesis, but judging from the abstract, I assume that she has treated Catullus's influence on Ronsard adequately, so that another study would be repetitious. Consequently, I have dismissed Catullus from consideration, except where he is closely allied with Propertius and Tibullus, as is the case in various sixteenth-century editions of the three elegiac poets. In part two, however, I have included Ovid in my study of elegiac themes in Ronsard's poetry, because Ovid, along with Propertius and Tibullus, treated the conventional elegiac themes and in this respect is more truly representative of the Roman

elegy as a literary genre than is Catullus.

A study of the reputation of Propertius and Tibullus in the sixteenth century is essential in determining their importance in the literary currents of the age. An examination of the various editions of their works, beginning with the first printed editions in 1472 and continuing almost every year thereafter through the sixteenth century, shows an amazing renascence of interest in the two poets. After the almost total eclipse which they had suffered in the Middle Ages, the rediscovery of their works was marked by a popularity which must have approximated that which they had enjoyed in their own age. This popularity continued throughout the sixteenth century, but after 1592 editions of Propertius and Tibullus are less numerous, and interest in them seems to wane. Their elegies were edited by some of the most renowned humanists of the Renaissance. Perhaps the fact that sixteenth-century scholars were interested in solving the difficulties presented by the Propertius and Tibullus manuscripts may account, in part, for the great number of editions. Each scholar had his own emendations, so that toward the end of the century we find editions appearing with emendations of the emendations of previous editions.

It is necessary to point out that the revival of interest in Propertius and Tibullus was largely confined to the intellectual élite. Evidence of this is shown by the fact that no translation of their complete works was made until 1653-1654. Selections of their poetry, however, appeared in various anthologies of Latin poetry, sometimes in translation, but more often in the original text. Adaptations, imitations, and allusions are rather numerous.

Part two of this work consists of a study of Ronsard's debt to the Roman elegy, considered solely from the point of view of his treatment of elegiac themes. Such an approach to the subject has not, so far as the writer knows, been used heretofore, but it has yielded interesting results. Part three treats of the actual imitations of Propertius and Tibullus, in which Ronsard either translates, paraphrases, transposes, or "contaminates" the two Latin poets.

Part I

THE FORTUNE OF PROPERTIUS AND TIBULLUS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO FRANCE

Propertius and Tibullus suffered almost total oblivion in Europe during the Middle Ages. The earliest notices of the two elegists come from France, and Norden, Seyffert, Ehwald, and Sandys feel that despite the uncertainties and numerous difficulties in tracing the fortune of Propertius and Tibullus during the Middle Ages, the tradition of their being preserved and better known in France than elsewhere seems well substantiated. It was probably Petrarch, however, who first interested the Renaissance in the two elegists. Beginning with the first printed editions of their elegies in 1472, keen interest in the two poets was reawakened for the first time since antiquity, and fifty-six editions of their poetry appeared, chiefly in Italy, France, and Holland, until 1592, after which date fewer editions came out. In addition to actual editions of their works, their popularity in the Renaissance may be judged by the frequency with which they appear in anthologies and are quoted by sixteenth-century writers.

The humanists were particularly interested in Propertius, largely on account of the problems presented by the manuscripts. Consequently, such scholars as Gulielmus Canter, Marc-Antoine Muret, and Lucas Fruytiers published *Variae Lectiones*, containing emendations of the text of Propertius and Tibullus. Three of the most renowned scholars of the century brought out editions of the elegists. Beroaldus edited Propertius, and Joseph Scaliger and Muret gave editions of Catullus, Propertius, and Tibullus.

The Latin elegists held an important place in the curriculum of the Collège de Coqueret. Dorat admired them, reading them and commenting on them to his pupils. We also know that he was interested in emending the Propertius text, for Lucas Fruytiers cites him constantly in his *Verisimilia* regarding problems of the Propertius manuscripts. We may perhaps charge Dorat with having misguided his disciples

in the formation of their literary tastes, since he himself placed the neo-Latin and Italian imitators on the same plane with the Latin elegists. It is quite certain that Dorat communicated his enthusiasm for the neo-Latins and the Italians to his students, and it may very well be due to his influence that Ronsard and his friends frequently go to these poets for inspiration, rather than to their Roman models.

Three poetic treatises of the sixteenth century extol Propertius and Tibullus as models of the erotic elegy: Du Bellay's *Deffence et Illustration de la langue francoyse,* and the *Art Poétique* of both Jacques Peletier du Mans and of Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaye. Ronsard's *Abbregé de l'Art poëtique François* indicates that he admired only five or six Latin poets, whom he lists in the *Troisième préface de la Franciade,* including Propertius and Tibullus. Estienne Pasquier testifies to his admiration for Propertius and Tibullus in the sixth book of his celebrated *Recherches de la France.* A humanist, Julius Caesar Scaliger, appraises the two poet's in his *Poetices.*

As an indication of the esteem in which Propertius and Tibullus were held by the poets of the sixteenth century, we have studied what Du Bellay, one of the two great poets of the age, said about them in his poetry. He seems to have felt that the manner of Propertius and Tibullus was too consciously simple and direct and hence artificial. When he renounces Petrarch because of his affectations and mannerisms, he puts the Latin elegists in the same category and renounces them likewise. Du Bellay translated some fragments of Propertius for use by Loys le Roy in the commentary of his translation of Plato's *Symposium.*

A detailed study of the reputation of Propertius and Tibullus among the neo-Latin poets of the sixteenth century has not been undertaken in this thesis, but it was indicated that the debt of such neo-Latins as Marullus, Pontanus, and Joannes Secundus was great.

Part II

THE USE OF CLASSICAL ELEGIAC THEMES BY RONSARD: HIS DEBT TO THE ROMAN ELEGY

In reading the critical material at present available on the sources of Ronsard's inspiration, the writer became convinced that most of the critics have allowed such great figures as Vergil, Homer, and Pindar, who directly inspired Ronsard's more pretentious works, the "oeuvres de longue haleine," to overshadow the less imposing figures, whose works Ronsard "pillaged" for use in the composition of the "petits genres," chiefly the erotic poetry. The Latin elegists belong to the second group. Since by far the largest portion of Ronsard's complete works may be classified as love poetry of various types, it is readily apparent that the rôle of the Latin elegists, who were concerned almost exclusively with love in all its various manifestations, should be of great importance as source material for the *Amours*, the *Livret de Folastries*, the *Elegies*, the *Sonnets pour Helene*, and the *Odes*.

Pierre de Nolhac, after admitting that Ronsard knew the Latin elegists marvelously well and that they were a part of his "premier bagage de latiniste," later makes the statement that they do not occupy as important a place in Ronsard's works as one would naturally expect of a passionate singer of love.[1] M. Chamard likewise asserts that the elegists were read extensively at the Collège de Coqueret, but were less imitated than one would think, with Petrarch evidently usurping their domain.[2] This statement is true of Du Bellay, but, in our opinion, does not apply to Ronsard. A third great student of the sixteenth century, Pierre Villey, supports the contentions of M. Chamard and M. de Nolhac with regard to the influence of the elegists.[3] On the other hand, M. Laumonier, who, having undoubtedly studied the influence of the elegists more exhaustively than anyone else, has a fuller real-

1. P. de Nolhac, *Ronsard et l'humanisme* (Paris: Champion, 1921), pp. 23, 41.

2. Henri Chamard, *Joachim du Bellay* (Lille, 1900), p. 59.

3. Pierre Villey, *Les Sources d'idées au XVIe siècle* (Paris: Plon, 1912), p. 23.

ization of Ronsard's debt to them, but makes no arbitrary statement about their relative influence.

By far the largest part of Ronsard's debt to Propertius and Tibullus consists of reminiscences, the use of colorful elegiac details, and especially characteristic themes, rather than actual translation, paraphrase, transposition, or contamination. This also holds true for the other elegists, Catullus and Ovid. Hence it is our contention that in order to ascertain the full extent of Ronsard's debt to the Latin elegists, one must study not only those cases where he imitates directly a verse or a whole passage, but also those in which he borrows a conventional theme or an elegiac detail and includes it without actually translating or paraphrasing the language of the Latin poets. Critics have heretofore approached the problem chiefly from the standpoint of similarities of lines and passages without regard for analogies of theme. We have studied Ronsard's treatment of conventional Roman elegiac themes as found in the works of the three most representative poets of the genre, Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid.

In order to understand thoroughly Ronsard's treatment of these Roman elegiac themes, it is necessary to study his notion of the elegy, not only with regard to its content but also its form, and to see how he applies his concepts to his own poetry. In general, we may say that Ronsard agrees in theory, at least, with the traditional ideas which his age had of the elegy, although he rarely puts them into practise. It is interesting to examine here those "poetic treatises" with which Ronsard was familiar and which may very well have influenced his ideas on the elegy as a genre.

The theorists of the elegy who were contemporaries of Ronsard are Thomas Sebillet (*L'Art poétique françoys*, 1548), Claude de Boissière (*Art poétique réduict en abrégé en singulier ordre et souverain méthode*, 1554), Joachim Du Bellay (*La Deffence et Illustration de la langue francoyse*, 1549), and finally Jacques Peletier du Mans (*L'Art poëtique*, 1555). A very important Latin work of the period which contains a discussion of the elegy is Julius Caesar Scaliger's *Poetices* (1561). Examination of these works of literary criticism re-

veals that the authors were in a deplorable state of confusion and vagueness concerning the genre. All of them follow in the footsteps of Clément Marot, who confused the elegy with the epistle. Marot's disciples imitated their master, and the literary theorists continued the tradition.[4] Sebillet entitles his chapter on the elegy: *De l'Epistre, ét de l'Elegie, et de leurs différences;* Claude de Boissière writes *Des Epistres et Elegies;* and Jacques Peletier, *De l'Epitre e de l'Elegie: e de la Satire.* Du Bellay likewise treats the elegy in connection with the epistle. The error which all of them except Jacques Peletier du Mans make is in attempting to define solely on the basis of content a genre which was determined principally by its form, according to the ancient conception. The sixteenth-century critics claimed to have derived their theories of the elegy from the ancient rhetoricians, who were also very vague and inexact in their treatment of the subject, especially with regard to the origin of the genre. Consequently, the literary theorists of the Renaissance fell into the error of their predecessors by using their theory that the elegy was derived from laments for the dead as the basis for all those definitions of the elegy which did not suffice to distinguish it from the epistle.[5]

All the confusion and misapprehensions concerning the elegy found in the poetic treatises of the period are likewise apparent in Ronsard's conception of this genre. Although

---

4. Dora Elisabeth Frey, *Le Genre élégiaque dans l'oeuvre de Ronsard* (Liège: Thone, 1939), p. 8.

5. The ancient rhetoricians defined the elegy first and foremost on the basis of its meter: the elegiac distich, but they also attributed to it rather vaguely certain characteristic themes, didactic, hortatory, and erotic, and emphasized particularly its threnodic aspect since they thought that the lament for the dead was the earliest function of the genre. Modern scholarship has arrived at the conclusion that this theory of the origin of the elegy is erroneous. The genre was used by the Greeks for a more simple but more formal expression of personal feeling and reflection than that of lyrical poetry. It lacked, however, the majestic sweep and seriousness of the epic, from which it derived its meter through a weakening process. Rather is represented an intermediate genre between the epic and lyric poetry. The confusion of the sixteenth-century French critics is quite understandable since they rejected the elegiac distich which was the principal criterion of the genre used by the ancient rhetoricians and went to Clément Marot's medieval elegies "à rimes plates" for the form of the French elegy. Then they attempted to define the genre on the basis of its subject matter as discussed by the ancient rhetoricians who were themselves confused and inexact regarding this aspect of the elegy.

he agrees in theory with the poetics, as has been pointed out, he rarely applies his theories to his works. Among the poetic genres of antiquity which were recommended for imitation by the *Deffence,* the elegy was the last to be cultivated by Ronsard. It was not until 1567, in the second edition of the *Oeuvres,* that the poet collected all the elegies scattered throughout the books of odes, sonnets, and hymns and grouped them into four separate books. Perhaps the opinion expressed in the poetic treatises mentioned above, that the elegy is the easiest of all genres, influenced Ronsard to practise the more pretentious genres in keeping with his great ambition. During the years of his "crise de pindarisme" he wrote no elegies. But in 1553, when the publication of the *Livret de Folastries* indicated a change to a more popular style, the first three elegies appeared in the second edition of the *Cinquieme Livre des odes augmenté.*

The tortuous path which the elegy followed in its evolution in Ronsard's works may be explained by his conception of the genre. Ronsard was elegiac in temperament, but because he failed to delimit clearly the proper domain of the elegy, he confused it with the ode, the sonnet, the epistle, the chanson, and in some cases even with the hymn and the blason. The Ronsardian elegy realized its full potentialities only when other erotic genres did not compete with it. Elegiac themes in Ronsard's poetry must not, therefore, be sought in his elegies alone, but rather throughout his whole work.

Ronsard's debt to the Roman elegy is so great that it is possible to chart the course of the typical Roman elegiac love affair in most of its conventional manifestations by using themes gleaned from his erotic and pastoral poetry. We shall list these themes common both to Ronsard and the Roman elegists. The elegiac theme which occurs most frequently in Ronsard's love poetry is that of the tortures of love, which was a central motif of the Roman elegy. As the Roman elegists complained of the excessive cruelty of their mistresses and of the mental and physical anguish which unrequited love caused them, Ronsard, like Petrarch, makes this theme the cornerstone of his erotic poetry and treats it in all its psychological

aspects, refining it to the point where it tends to become a mere "casuistique amoureuse." Long nights of insomnia and the worry and anguish of repeated frustration injure the lover's health and he becomes pale and languorous. The poets, like the Romantic esthetes of nineteenth-century French literature, picture themselves and other lovers as wan and frail. They regard love as imprisonment, for every action after they fall in love depends entirely upon the mistress. For that reason they refer frequently to the chains and fetters of love, and they sing farewell to their liberty. When their mistresses' cruelty abuses the limits of their patience, they beseech the gods for deliverance from their bonds.

They complain not only because they are forced to surrender their liberty when they fall into Love's clutches, but equally because the young god afflicts them with an incurable malady which no drug or magic charm, however potent, can cure.

They often draw parallels between love and war, for is not a lover the slave of Venus or Cupid and does he not have to plan a wily campaign in order to gain his mistress's favors? The act of love itself is frequently referred to as a "battle."

The poets denounce war in no uncertain terms and glorify the joys of peace, chief of which is love. They naturally prefer love to war, but they sometimes feel forced to explain why they are not taking part in a particular campaign. Their reason is that love and their mistresses forbid it.

Often the poets ardently protest their everlasting fidelity to their mistresses in words apparently of genuine sincerity and feeling. The mistresses, however, usually remain insensible to such pleas. After enduring many humiliations and much anguish, the poets break into triumphal songs of exultation whenever they are admitted to their ladies' boudoir. The question of fidelity in love versus infidelity is one of the chief preoccupations of the poets, and they all extol fidelity and anathematize infidelity. Despite their protestations of faith and their concern for the fidelity of their mistresses, they sometimes flagrantly contradict themselves and openly advocate free love. Their pretext is that love is irresistible.

It is a passion over which they have no control, since Venus and Cupid have charge of all matters erotic, and it is futile for mortals to resist the will of the gods. The poets find further justification for their infidelities in their belief that the gods do not heed lovers' oaths.

They are unanimous in their praise of beauty unadorned and in their condemnation of the use of cosmetics and rich gowns. They profess to prefer the charming simplicity of the country maid unskilled in the artifices of love.

Sometimes the mistresses fall ill and the poets address prayers to the gods for their recovery. Whenever their mistresses went on a journey and deserted them or whenever they themselves were forced to depart and expose their lady-loves to the attentions of their rivals, the poets lament long and bitterly.

They complain bitterly also when their ladies bar their doors and refuse them entrance. They are then forced to keep vigil on the doorstep, despite inclement weather, playing the rôle of "exclusi amatores." Addressing the mistress's unyielding door they sing the *paraclausithyron*, and frequently hang up garlands as expiatory offerings. Perhaps the most amusing figure in this conventional poetry is the elegiac dog, which was set as a guard over the mistress by her jealous husband or her "lena," and which always barked most inopportunely for the poets.

The Roman elegists and Horace attributed many of their mistresses' infidelities to the evil influence of the "lena," the loathsome old pander who advised her "wards" to prefer wealthy lovers to the poets. For revenge, the poets anathematize the "lena" in violent and bitter diatribes. Ronsard frequently makes use of this Latin elegiac theme, and rivals Tibullus in the intensity of his anger. The elegiac "lena" was usually also a "saga" or witch and thus versed in all manner of magic. Her specialty was love charms and potions; she could summon spirits from their graves, draw the moon and stars from the sky, make rivers and streams run backwards, influence the weather, charm crops out of the fields, and stop the course of the angry snake. Ronsard makes extensive use

of most of these themes.

The Roman elegists, like all antiquity, were keenly aware of the brevity of youth and of the ravaging effects of old age. Propertius, in particular, was haunted by premonitions of an early death. All of them, therefore, in an effort to make their mistresses more compliant, advised complete enjoyment of the pleasures of youth before senility and death rendered these joys impossible. This hedonistic theme, which is a commonplace of classical literature, is one of Ronsard's favorites, and he borrows many details from the Roman elegists in his use of it.

Ronsard and the Roman elegists were interested in their prerogatives as poets: in the source of their inspiration, in their unique power to confer eternal fame upon others as well as upon themselves, and in the genre of poetry which they were destined to write. They all claimed love and their mistresses as the *sine qua non* of their poetry. One of the principal prerogatives of the poet was his exclusive power to confer immortality upon those whom he celebrated in verse. Naturally the poets accorded this honor only to a chosen few, who should have been eternally grateful for such distinction. The power of the poet to confer immortality upon others naturally presupposed his own immortality, and Ronsard and the elegists were confident that their poetry would survive the ravages of time. The Roman elegists proudly proclaimed that their field was the elegy, but frequently they lamented the fact that their Muse was unable to sing of war and arms and the glory of the nation. On occasion, they bade farewell to love and the elegy, but the struggle between epic and elegy was always short, for they resumed their erotic themes and elegiac meter after brief attempts to sing the praises of their patrons. Ronsard seemed to follow their precedent, for he often discussed the struggle between the epic and erotic genres for supremacy in his inspiration. Like Propertius and Horace, he maintained that poetry is the most permanent of all the arts; that after monuments of bronze and marble have crumbled, the written word endures.

Miscellaneous elegiac themes which Ronsard treated con-

cern advice and techniques of love-making; Venus, as the protectress of lovers in their nocturnal adventures; wine, as a remedy for the sorrows of love; the rival claims of love and wealth; the greedy merchant as a rhetorical type; and idyllic love during the Golden Age.

A comparison of the principal themes treated by the Roman elegists with their counterparts in Ronsard's poetry shows the importance of the French poet's debt to the Roman elegy. Although Ronsard's inspiration in many cases was modified by the influence of the neo-Latin and the Italian love poets, chiefly Petrarch, nevertheless the predominant tone and feeling of his erotic poetry is more often elegiac than Petrarchian or medieval. The fact that he succeeded so well in capturing the Roman elegiac spirit and that he borrowed so many typical elegiac themes proves the first contention of M. de Nolhac, that the Roman elegists were a part of Ronsard's "premier bagage de latiniste." It must be recognized that Ronsard's treatment of elegiac themes is seldom servile or labored; on the contrary, he ordinarily gives an original touch to a theme, making it the medium of the expression of his own emotions and adapting it to the occasion or circumstances which inspired his poem, while preserving its original spirit. In some instances, it seems quite probable that the poet had so absorbed and assimilated the poetry of the Roman elegists that his borrowing of a theme or characteristic detail from them was quite unconscious. At any rate, Ronsard's poetry gives evidence of an amazingly profound knowledge of the works of the Roman elegists, not only of their general spirit and tone, but also of their structure and most minute details.

Part III

IMITATION OF PROPERTIUS AND TIBULLUS BY RONSARD

Ronsard testifies to his acquaintance with Propertius and Tibullus through his mention of the two poets in his poetry, thereby revealing his attitude toward them, in his translation of fragments of their elegies which he made for Pierre de la

Ramée for the latter's *Dialecticae partitiones*, and finally in his use of pertinent passages from their verses as epigraphs. According to his own testimony, Ronsard considers Propertius and Tibullus not only as masters of the elegy but also as great poets of burning passion. He admires the frank, straightforward, and popular style in which Tibullus sings his passion for Delia, and after his Pindaric period he proposes to express his love with a "beau stille bas" in Tibullian vein. Furthermore, he recommends reading and imitation of the two Latins as part of the training of the French poet, and he himself admits that they are the models of his erotic poetry. Several times Ronsard expresses the desire to join Propertius and Tibullus and their mistresses in Elysium, and in his Utopia ("Les Isles Fortunées") he pictures Muret reading the Roman elegists to the Pléiade. He also points out Tibullus as an example of a poet who possessed the poetic fury which only the Muses bestow.

Careful analysis of Ronsard's poetry reveals that, besides borrowing characteristic elegiac themes from Propertius and Tibullus, he also frequently imitates them directly by transposition, paraphrase, or "contamination," and every genre of his poetry contains at least one souvenir of the two elegists. Erotic and pastoral themes predominate, with Tibullus furnishing most of the latter. The most extensive imitations come from the *Corpus Tibullianum*, and in particular, from the *Panegyricus Messallae*, from which Ronsard borrows many passages and themes for his occasional poetry. It is significant with regard to Ronsard's taste that many of his imitations of the *Corpus* are of the inferior elegies, now considered to have been written not by Tibullus, but by the other members of Messalla's literary coterie. Ronsard's direct imitation of Propertius is limited mostly to short observations, reminiscences, and characteristic details of an erotic nature, but these are so numerous that they indicate a very thorough acquaintance with the Latin poet's work.

Examination of the way in which Ronsard handled the source material which he took from Propertius and Tibullus demonstrates the poet's method of procedure. In some cases,

he borrows a particularly vivid detail from the two Latin poets, assimilating it into the rest of his poem, so that it fits perfectly into the whole. Sometimes he imitates the opening lines of a poem which has impressed him, but usually the imitation stops here and the poet continues in his own vein; or occasionally he ends his poem with an observation or maxim on love taken from the two Latin poets. One of Ronsard's favorite devices is to imitate at length a passage from Propertius or Tibullus, adding applicable details gleaned from similar passages in other Latin or Greek poets, thus ending with a composite treatment of the theme. Most frequently, he develops a few lines from the elegists into a long strophe by adding his own details and reminiscences of his vast reading of classical authors. In a few cases, however, he finds Propertius and Tibullus too lengthy for his purposes, so he paraphrases them briefly.

This study has demonstrated above all that Ronsard succeeded admirably in capturing the spirit of the Roman elegy, that he adopted many of the conventional mannerisms and poses which Propertius and Tibullus many centuries before had used to sing of the consuming passions which inspired so much poetry in their turbulent hearts, and that he managed to express in similar vein all the warmth and ardor of his own passionate nature. In setting forth imitation of the "beau stille bas et populaire" of Tibullus as the stylistic goal of his erotic poetry, Ronsard succeeded perhaps too well, for all too often he is more "bas" and more "populaire" than the Latin poet.

Conclusion

The writer believes that this study has succeeded in revealing new information with regard to the fortune of Propertius and Tibullus in sixteenth-century France. He feels that by careful enumeration of the editions of the two Latin poets, beginning with the first printed editions at the close of the fifteenth century and continuing throughout the sixteenth, by examination of discussions of the poets in Renaissance poetic treatises, and by investigation of sixteenth-century translations, anthologies, and emendations of their works, he has

proved that the Roman elegists enjoyed a great vogue during the whole Renaissance. The fact that Dorat was fond of their poetry and read their works to his pupils at the Collège de Coqueret, the training school of the Pléiade, establishes a definite point of contact with the most important school of French Renaissance poets. In studying the direct influence of Propertius and Tibullus on Pierre de Ronsard, the writer has added to M. Laumonier's already long list of direct imitations and reminiscences in the works of the French poet. Analysis of Ronsard's use of *conventional* Roman elegiac themes, in the writer's opinion, reveals that his debt to the Roman elegy is much more extensive than has heretofore been realized.

VITA

Robert Edward Hallowell was born in Charleston, Illinois on August 30, 1918. He received his primary and secondary education at the Eastern Illinois State Teachers College Training School and High School, and was granted a bachelor's degree with high honor by the College in 1939 with a major in Latin and minors in French, German, and English. He continued his studies in 1939-1940 as a graduate scholar in French at the University of Illinois, from which he received the master's degree in French in 1940. For the past two years he has been a fellow in French. He has had the privilege of attending graduate courses in French literature taught by Professors J. F. Jackson, S.F. Will, P. E. Jacob, T. E. Oliver, and D. H. Carnahan, courses in Italian literature given by Professor John Van Horne, and courses in Latin literature taught by Professors H. V. Canter and B. F. Perry, all of whom he wishes to thank for their inspiration and sympathetic interest.

In addition to his work at the University of Illinois, he has studied at the French Summer School of McGill University (1938) and at the Ecole Française of Middlebury College (summer of 1939). During the summer of 1941 he took courses in Spanish at the National University of Mexico, Mexico City.

He is a member of Phi Kappa Phi, Kappa Delta Pi, and Pi Delta Phi (national honorary society in French).